



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to Roger Sherman. The argument is carefully drawn and shows that Sherman was the most active in behalf of the state-equality plan.

In the address upon "Marshall" the author exhibits most strikingly the strength and weakness of his conception of history. He gives free rein to his personal sympathies; in consequence he is always the Federalist historian. This probably enables him to explain Federalist ideas, policies, and the invaluable services of Hamilton, Marshall, and other Federalist leaders in a more effective fashion than would be obtained from the use of a more scientific method. On the other hand, it prevents him from doing justice to the ideas and policies for which Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin stood. The author's accuracy and fair-mindedness prevent misstatements of fact; his partizanship is that of tone, emphasis, and implication; but it is after all partizanship, not history.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*Letters of Dorothea, Princess Lieven, during her Residence in London, 1812-1834.* Translated and edited by LIONEL G. ROBINSON. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1902. Pp. xx, 414.)

THE letters of Dorothea, Princess Lieven, written from London while ambassador at the British court, should have more than one claim to the interest of the historian. While covering a period of great interest and written with a full and intimate knowledge of events and people of the utmost importance, they are first of all valuable because of the personality of the writer. This charming and forceful woman was the daughter of General Benckendorff and his German wife, the latter a lifetime close friend of the Princess Maria of Württemberg, afterwards the wife of Paul I. of Russia. Upon the mother's death the four small children were bequeathed to the care of the Empress, whose charge they immediately became. Brought up in the Russian court, under the supervision of the Empress, who was scrupulously conscientious in the discharge of her duty, Dorothea absorbed and developed a patriotism for country and a loyalty to the Emperor which in the mature woman amounted to a ruling passion. In 1800, when but fifteen years old, she was married to Count de Lieven, who was then a lieutenant-colonel in the Russian army, but who soon entered diplomatic life, and in 1809 became Russian envoy at the Prussian court. When in 1812 Lieven was appointed ambassador to London, his young and charming wife was but twenty-six, though already distinguished as an exceptionally able and clever woman, whose influence as a diplomatist was credited with being quite as effective, though indirectly exerted, as that of the official representative. Other letters, already published, attest her intimate knowledge of the times and give evidence of close personal intercourse and confidential correspondence with Lord Grey, Palmerston, and Wellington, while her correspondence with Metternich indicates a reciprocal interest which was not always concerned with the diplomatic or political side of life.

The present letters, written to her brother, Count Benckendorff, contain, for the first thirteen years of London residence, little else than current London gossip or matters of family interest. In 1825, however, simultaneously with the advancement of Count Benckendorff to the position of Chief of the Third Division, involving a daily conference with the Czar, the character of the correspondence shows a striking change and exhibits a curious mixture; in it Princess Lieven provides a semi-journalistic side-light on men and events in England, emphasizes her own and her husband's intimate connection with and their hold upon English ministers, indulges in abject and fulsome flattery of the person and abilities of the Czar, and indirectly, yet unquestionably, manages to create the impression that her own indirect diplomacy is often of greater moment in forwarding Russian interests than are the more formal efforts of her husband. In short, Madame de Lieven unconsciously reveals herself as an intelligent, active, and charming woman, with much liking for and cleverness in intrigue, and also as ambitious for personal distinction. It is to be noted also that these letters were being regularly communicated, with the writer's knowledge, to Count Nesselrode, the Russian foreign minister.

Aside, however, from the delineation of Madame de Lieven's own character there is little of new historical interest. The letters are attractive in form, but neither add information as to the workings of Russian diplomacy nor offer any convincing characterizations of English politicians. In the first case Madame de Lieven, with all her originality, was never bold enough to offer an opinion on projects initiated at Petersburg, in other than flattering terms. She poses, in fact, as a devout believer in the omniscience of the Petersburg government, so that her comments on current international questions are devoid of color and of novelty. The same devotion to Russian interests, when applied to events in England, renders her opinions in that field also of little value, although here she was quite free to speak her mind. Everything is examined and criticized from the point of view of Russian interest. Canning is at first, from 1815 to 1820, imbued with "Jacobinism" and with revolutionary ideas and is a dangerous man, but suddenly in 1827 he becomes in every way admirable. Wellington is at one time the faithful friend, then, after Canning's death, a miserable traitor; moreover, he is the strong minister sure to hold his own, or an inefficient, sure to fall, according as Madame de Lieven sees in him a friend or a foe of Russian policy. Of purely English questions and events she has perhaps a clearer conception, but these are but hurriedly noted, as having no direct bearing on diplomacy.

In effect, then, Madame de Lieven's own personality and the conditions under which she wrote largely destroy in this volume the value of her comments. Her letters give evidence also that the active meddling with which she was credited by contemporaries did have existence in fact. She was unquestionably on very intimate terms with many notable men, but that she actually moulded their political acts is exceedingly

doubtful. For example, statements made to her by Palmerston or by Grey in familiar conversation are reported in her letters as positively to be depended upon, and as foreshadowing some decided change in English diplomacy. When the events belie the prophecy, Palmerston becomes an ingrate and Grey an imbecile, but her own gullibility is lost sight of. She seems rather to have been used by English ministers than to have used them. If then the present volume has any especial value as an addition to historical knowledge, it is that it renders possible a more exact estimate of Madame de Lieven herself. Yet every page offers entertaining and pleasant reading, while the careful work of the editor and translator, Mr. Robinson, has supplied excellent explanatory notes for otherwise blind references.

E. D. ADAMS.

*Il Generale Carlo Filangieri, Principe di Satriano e Duca di Taormina.* Per TERESA FILANGIERI FIESCHI RAVASCHIERI. (Milan : Fratelli Treves. 1902. Pp. 371.)

DURING the forty-two years which have elapsed since the fall of the Neapolitan Bourbons no work has appeared relating to the history of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies in the nineteenth century, or to any episode or period in it, which may be termed the product of wide research directed by relative impartiality — one work only excepted, Raffaele De Cesare's *La Fine di un Regno* (Città di Castello, 1900, 2 vols.). The importance of the second and greatly amplified edition of this work, as De Cesare himself states in his dedication to the Duchessa Teresa Ravaschieri, lies in the results of his extensive researches in the Archivio Filangieri, preserved in the Museo Civico Gaetano Filangieri of Naples. The principal feature of this museum is the collection of papers, books, relics, etc., left by Generale Carlo Filangieri, who for half a century was one of the chief figures in the political life of the Two Sicilies. De Cesare has made extensive and intelligent use of this material so far as it relates to the years 1848–1860, the period covered by his work, but the material upon earlier years has remained untouched. It is with the purpose of editing much of this earlier material, of editing more fully that of 1848–1860, and of thus honoring the memory of Carlo Filangieri, that his daughter, the Duchessa Ravaschieri, has published the present volume of biography.

During the long period of his public activity Filangieri preserved carefully a wealth of documents which concerned him, and wrote from time to time extended autobiographical *Rivordi*, or memoirs. The documents, for the most part inedited, are quoted freely and at length throughout la Ravaschieri's biography, while long extracts from the memoirs form almost the entire contents of many chapters, and it is in these documents and in the testimony that Filangieri himself offers in his narrative upon all the events in which he participated that the importance of this volume lies. Filangieri was a man of modern spirit and ideas, but a warm supporter of the autonomy of the Two Sicilies, and therefore opposed to Italian unity. Sincerely devoted to Murat, he was also faithful to the